



19 16:50
14/10

1 **Speaking points by Lithuania**

2 **Strategic Goal A**

3 **Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps**
4 **they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.**

5 **Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and**
6 **local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being**
7 **incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.**

8 **Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are**
9 **eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and**
10 **positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed**
11 **and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant**
12 **international obligations, taking into account national socioeconomic conditions.**

13 **Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have**
14 **taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and**
15 **consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe**
16 **ecological limits.**

17 Lithuania believes that Goal A of Strategic Plan is of substantial importance and underlines that
18 implementation of Goal A would stimulate implementation of the other Goals of the Strategic
19 Plan. Therefore, we need to focus on Goal A as at this stage we still face limited capacity and low
20 political priority for implementing the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets by 2020 as well as
21 insufficient mainstreaming of biodiversity into all relevant policy fields.

22 Lithuania thinks that for promoting the implementation of the Goal A, there are many useful and
23 technically sound **policy support tools present**, from the Convention and from other relevant
24 organizations. Therefore focus should be on using the tools we already have more effectively,
25 through better communication, rather than seeking to divert resources to developing new tools
26 that will take time may not be a priority.

27 **With respect to Target 1**

28 We recognise that existing policy support tools and methodologies as the programme of work on
29 communication, education, and public awareness (CEPA) and its toolkits, annual celebrations of
30 the International Day for Biodiversity as well as tools developed by zoos and aquariums,
31 botanical gardens and museums contribute to biodiversity awareness raising that is slowly
32 increasing.

33 However, various existing policy support tools and methodologies for biodiversity awareness
34 raising, especially at national level, are of general nature and expensive to implement. Precise
35 data on the deployment of the tools for biodiversity awareness raising is not available and there's
36 only limited assessment of the impact existing policy support tools and methodologies, in
37 particular, at global level.

38 Therefore, the future work should focus on reviewing and synthesizing existing evidence on
39 methods used to raise awareness; and further develop guidance and methods on how to best raise
40 awareness if needed.

41 Additionally, it is crucial to develop methods for translating biodiversity awareness into
42 behavioural change.



43 **As regards Target 2**

44 We realise that a number of policy support tools were established to facilitate evaluation of
45 biodiversity values, especially of economic nature, as well as integration of these values in
46 decision making, including development and poverty reduction strategies.

47 However, at this stage is unclear to what extent these tools are used. It is worth to emphasize that
48 integration of biodiversity values in development and poverty reduction strategies, planning
49 processes, national accounting and reporting systems require considerable technical capacity,
50 time and financial resources as well as political will.

51 Taking this into account, there's a need to generate knowledge and develop methods for valuation
52 of biodiversity including non-economical (social and cultural) values.

53 In addition, it is important to develop and promote tools to facilitate the inclusion of biodiversity
54 values into national planning processes, instruments and accounting.

55 Finally, we are of the opinion that development of indicators and data sets and standardized data
56 collection for global level monitoring implementation of Target 2 would be helpful.

57 **Concerning Target 3**

58 We realize that the elimination of harmful to biodiversity subsidies is of high importance for the
59 conservation of biological diversity, and, in our opinion, the main obstacle to achieve Target 3 is
60 that the development of positive incentives may require the adoption of new legislation as well as
61 budget allocations. The reform of incentive mechanisms will need to involve national authorities
62 and will require cooperation across relevant sectors and with the stakeholders impacted by
63 changes to current incentive schemes or mechanisms. The sensitivity of discussion related to
64 incentive reform is a major obstacle to the use of the policy support tools and methodologies that
65 have been developed.

66 In order to achieve target 3, there may be a need to develop guidance on identifying harmful
67 incentives and subsidies to support Parties to eliminate, phase out or reform subsidies that have
68 negative impacts on biodiversity.

69 **With respect to Target 4**

70 We recognize that sustainable production and consumption can have a positive effect on
71 conservation of biological diversity and natural resources. In this regard we see that the main
72 obstacle to achieve Target 4 is that the tools are of general nature and it is difficult for them to be
73 practically applied at national level or by different economic sectors. A further obstacle is that for
74 meaningful action to be taken towards this target there must be dialogue among national
75 authorities, economic sectors and stakeholders in order to develop effective plans for sustainable
76 consumption and production. The producers, consumers and other stakeholders can often be
77 overwhelmed by the abundance of standards and tools available.

78 Taking into consideration the obstacles encountered we would like to emphasize that for
79 achievement of Target 4 it would be important to develop tools and methods for effective
80 engagement of the production sector and consumers and to translate general global guidance into
81 nationally applicable tools and methods regarding Target 4.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Speaking Points by Lithuania

General statement for 1st session (Monday, am) on Agenda Items 3 and 4:

3. Facilitating the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets through scientific and technical means and

4. Assessing the effects of the types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of the Convention

Lithuania welcomes excellent work done by the CBD Secretariat which is made available to the Parties through the official documents SBSTTA/17/2 with its addenda 1 to 4 and SBSTTA/17/3.

European experts met early September this year on German island Vilm to discuss these documents and exchange their views on existing policy support tools and methodologies, and gaps and needs for further development of such tools and methodologies.

On the basis of these discussions and exchange of views, Lithuania thinks that for promoting the implementation of the Strategic Plan and Aichi Targets by 2020, there are many useful and technically sound **policy support tools present**, from the Convention and from other relevant organizations. The focus should be on using the tools we already have more effectively, through better communication, rather than seeking to divert resources to developing new tools that will take time may not be a priority.

We should make full use of relevant tools developed in other MEAs, international agencies and programmes (for example TEEB) and at national and regional levels. However, it is important that we seek to address barriers to implementation of the Strategic Plan. We recognise that some of these barriers include political will and limited capacity which are not readily addressed by SBSTTA alone.

The **identified obstacles, gaps and barriers** for the uptake and use of tools at the national level in document SBSTTA/17/2 para 22 are valid, but further efforts are necessary to increase the effective use of the tools at the national level, such as to encourage communication, coordination and cooperation between national actors and focal points working at the national and international levels.

We also are of the view that a review of experience from other relevant voluntary review-mechanisms might be useful. Such voluntary review-mechanisms could be relevant to assisting Parties in the implementation of the Strategic Plan at the national level. The results of experience review could be considered at future meetings of SBSTTA and WGRI.

As for **adequacy of observations, monitoring the biodiversity, data management and development of indicators**, we believe that there is a need to improve means of gathering and analysing data and to speed up its transformation into knowledge with a view to enable rapid policy responses and support implementation of the Strategic Plan. Smart choices are needed to continue or develop cost-effective monitoring systems, including by using proxies or expert assessment to complement indicators for which good data exists. A move towards more standardised data collection and harmonized use of indicators across countries is desirable and there are indicators among those ready for use at global level that are particularly suitable for use at national level.

We welcome activities undertaken by the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and other partners (such as GEO BON, IPBES, IUCN, WCMC,



44 FAO, UNDP, UNEP, GBIF), to provide support for use of the indicators and to further develop
45 practical information on the online reporting tool and the application of the indicators.

46 Therefore we suggest that the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Biodiversity Indicators
47 Partnership and other partners, continues to:

- 48 • further develop the indicators at all levels;
- 49 • provide capacity-building to support use of the indicators;
- 50 • further develop practical information/reporting on the application of the indicators;
- 51 • promote reporting harmonization with other Conventions; and
- 52 • maintain the online database.

53 Furthermore we suggest that Parties and other bodies:

- 54 • continue to support, prioritise and streamline in situ observation efforts that are scientifically
55 robust and quality-assured so as to provide reliable time series information;
- 56 • develop and implement plans for filling observation gaps with a view to their long-term
57 sustainability and with a view to fill gaps in coverage, including major biophysical gradients,
58 essential biodiversity variables and taxonomic groups;
- 59 • promote additional data gathering and monitoring through well-organised and scientifically
60 robust citizen science;
- 61 • enhance modelling efforts and to develop innovative survey techniques which can provide a
62 cost-effective way of filling some gaps in observations;
- 63 • assist in overcoming barriers in the use of remote sensing by promoting a closer relationship
64 between the earth observation community and potential users in the biodiversity policy and
65 management communities;
- 66 • mobilise existing data in standard formats to open and free access terms to facilitate analysis
67 for NBSAP and contribution to regional and global analysis

68 As for **scientific and technical needs related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan**, we
69 welcome the assessment of scientific and technical needs presented in document SBSTTA/17/2 and
70 its addenda. However, we feel that SBSTTA should seek only to identify those additional scientific
71 and technical needs which are essential to achieve the implementation of the Aichi targets and
72 which are not going to be addressed by other means. Such needs should be limited in number and
73 should be specific and achievable tasks for Parties and/or the Secretariat. In addition, SBSTTA may
74 wish to highlight where the work of others can contribute most effectively to the implementation of
75 the Strategic Plan and to communicate these priority needs to the relevant bodies. This should
76 include, for example: IPBES, Future Earth, GEO-BON, GBIF, BIP, FAO, IUCN and other.

77 **Concerning the Agenda Item 4 – [Assessing the effects of the types of measures taken in**
78 **accordance with the provisions of the Convention]** Lithuania is of the view that information
79 compiled by the Executive Secretary and provided in respective note constitutes a good basis for
80 future work on methodology how to assess the effects of the types of measures. We believe, that
81 small countries would wish that assessment of effects would not mean additional reporting burden.
82 In our opinion, the best choice would be constructing future assessments on the basis of national
83 reports, if needed of improved format, and drawing from the best experiences of the Parties.
84 Alternatively, the use of Aichi Targets indicators might be possible as they sufficiently cover all
85 aspects of the provisions of the Convention.